

1
2 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
3 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

4 TONY NGUYEN,
5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, et al.,
8 Defendants.
9

Case No. 2:21-cv-00134-GMN-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 82]

10 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to amend the caption of his complaint.¹
11 Docket No. 82. Plaintiff asks the Court to substitute Defendant The Tu Firm, A Professional Law
12 Corporation dba Law Offices of Hoang Huy Tu in place of Defendant Law Offices of Hoang Huy
13 Tu." *Id.* at 3. Defendants did not file a response, and the time to do so has now passed. *See*
14 Docket. The failure to respond to a motion constitutes a consent to the granting of the motion.
15 LR 7-2(d). Further, in examining the merits of the motion, good cause exists to grant Plaintiff's
16 unopposed request to amend his complaint. *See Middleton v. Human Behavior Inst., Ltd.*, 2017
17 WL 579896, at *1 n.2 (D. Nev. Feb. 13, 2017) (granting plaintiff's unopposed motion for leave
18 to file an amended complaint to correctly name a defendant).

19 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to amend the caption of his complaint, Docket No. 82, is
20 hereby **GRANTED**. The Clerk's Office is **INSTRUCTED** to substitute Defendant The Tu Firm,
21 A Professional Law Corporation dba Law Offices of Hoang Huy Tu in place of Defendant Law
22 Offices of Hoang Huy Tu.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: June 10, 2021

25
26 
Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

27
28 ¹ The Court liberally construes Plaintiff's filing, as he is proceeding *pro se*. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).